	Case 1:21-cv-01603-NONE-EPG Docum	ent 2 Filed 11/05/21 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ANTOINE DESHAWN BARNES,	Case No. 1:21-cv-01603-NONE-EPG (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE
13	v.	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14	MARCIE BARNES, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C.	
18	§ 1983 and Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388	
19	(1971). (ECF No. 1).	
20	The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on diversity	
21	jurisdiction, be brought only in: "(1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all	
22	defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located; (2) a judicial district in which	
23	a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part	
24	of property that is the subject of the action is situated; or (3) if there is no district in which an	
25	action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any	
26	defendant is subject to the court's personal jurisdiction with respect to such action." 28 U.S.C. §	
27	1391(b).	
28	1	

In this case, the Defendants do not reside in this District. Plaintiff alleges that the violation of his rights occurred in Alameda County, which is in the Northern District of California. Therefore, Plaintiff's claims should have been filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the correct district. 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. IT IS SO ORDERED. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Dated: November 5, 2021